

Applicants submit an Abstract of the Disclosure herewith on a separate sheet.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct minor typographical errors.

Applicants are not aware that the English used in the specification is non idiomatic English.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point out examples of improper English the require correction. Applicants propose to amend the title as described above.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,414,347 to Monk et al. in view of U.S. patent 4,215,347 Jarrell et al.

The combination of Monk et al. and Jarrell et al. does not suggest the present invention since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a method for simulating an aircraft missile during testing of an aircraft weapon system. Additionally, neither references suggests a feedback loop where new error/trouble signals are generated and fed from a target seeker to a weapon system and that such a feedback loop would be suitable for simulating an aircraft missile during testing of an aircraft weapon system.

While Monk et al. may suggest an apparatus for testing the operational status of a missile interface system, Monk et al. does not suggest that simulated missile conditions would be allowed to affect input to a missile control. Monk et al. also does not suggest the desirability of a control loop/feed-back. Monk et al. merely suggests the possibility of simulating missile conditions in order to obtain a method of testing the operational status of a missile interface in a weapon system in an aircraft.

Jarrell et al. suggests an ordinary control loop with feedback of an error/trouble signal. Control systems with feedback are well-known in many areas. However, Jarrell et al. does not suggest that feed-back of an error/trouble signal from a target seeker to a weapon system would be suitable for simulating an aircraft missile during testing of the aircraft weapon system.

Since Monk et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of Jarrell et al. and vice versa, the combination will suffer from the individual shortcomings of each reference. The Examiner appears to assert that the combination of Monk et al. and Jarrell et al. indicates that any type of method or device for simulating a missile would be considered obvious from the mere fact that there are other types of systems for simulating missiles available in combination with the fact that control loops with feedback of error/trouble signals are known. This, of course is not true.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose patentable features of the present invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not make the present invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would facilitate the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner

to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5127.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-2-02


Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicant
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: 202-424-7500